



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,413	06/01/2001	Jose Iborra	CHG-001.1P	3929
26717	7590	06/07/2005	EXAMINER	
RONALD CRAIG FISH, A LAW CORPORATION PO BOX 820 LOS GATOS, CA 95032			CHAVIS, JOHN Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/872,413

Applicant(s)

IBORRA ET AL.

Examiner

John Chavis

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/13/02, 07/15/02
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

PD

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- 1.
2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ryu et al. (5,481,718). The newly added features have been considered; however, it is merely descriptive material. It does not provide a new step or component of an apparatus (except for the phrase in claim 1 that begins "and if one or more errors are found..." However, this feature is considered inherent in the simulation provided by Ryu in the last step of claim 1.

3. Claims

Ryu

1. An automated software production tool for generating a complete, correct, non ambiguous specification in a formal language which defines a complete operable software program, comprising:

See col. 5 lines 25-30. Ryu provides for checking correctness semantically, see col. 11 lines 8-18.

a software generating computer programmed to: receive user input that defines a conceptual model

See col. 11 line 60-col. 12 lines 20, which provides for receiving user input. The static model is

which models a system for which a
computer program is to be written;

considered the conceptual model,
see figs. 9 and 29. Also, see col.
7 line 54 – col. 8 line 15.

convert said conceptual model into a
high level repository of formal
specification statements stated in a
formal language having rules of syntax
and semantics',

See col. 9 lines 49-53 in which
instances are created (formal
language specifications.

using...validating Said formal...specification
using the rules of syntax and semantics of
said formal language, and verifying that every
statement in said formal specification
is syntactically complete, semantically
correct and not ambiguous.

See col. 10 lines 42-51 in which a
simulation (validating) is carried
out. Also, see col. 11 lines 43-52
and the test process in col. 10
lines 62-col. 11 line 2.

The automatic feature (although taught by the previously cited references) is
provided via the dynamic processing unit, see col. 10 line 62- col. 11 line 3.

2. The system according to claim 1,
wherein said software-generating
computer is programmed to receive said

See figs. 7 and 11 and col. 12
lines 1-6.

user input using a CASE tool program
for presenting a graphical user
interface (GUI) to allow a user to input
the requirements of said formal
specification using a graphical tools to
model said conceptual model graphically.

3. The system according to claim 1
wherein said software-generating
computer is further programmed with a
system logic translator, which controls
said computer to process said formal
language specification into one or more
computer programs that can control a
computer to carry out... functions
modeled in said formal specification.

See the rejection of claim 2
above.

4. The system according to claim 3
wherein said software-generating
computer is further programmed with a
user interface translator, which controls
said computer to process said formal

See again the rejection of claim
2.

language specification into one or more computer programs that can control a computer to implement a particular user interface for the program created by said system logic translator which has been modeled in said formal specification.

5. The system according to claim 3 wherein said software-generating computer is further programmed with a database generator, which controls said computer to process said formal language specification into a data structure or database is capable of storing the values of at least all attributes of all objects defined in said formal specification in a manner such that the program or programs generated by said system logic translator can control a computer to read the values of said attributes at

“ “ “ “

any time or store new values for said
attributes at any time.

6. The system according to claim 1
wherein said software-generating
computer is further programmed by a
documentation generator for producing
documentation for the software
application based on the formal
specification.

“ “ “ “

In reference to claims 7, 13-15, 17-20, and 23-24, see the rejection of claim 1.
The newly added “displaying” feature in (for example) claim 7 is provided for via the GUI
in claim 1.

As per claims 8-10, see the rejection of claims 3-5.

The features of claims 1 1-12 are taught via claims 3 and 2, respectively.

Claim 16 is taught via claim 2.

In reference to claims 21-24, see the rejection of claim 3.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to John Chavis whose telephone number is (571) 272-
3720. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Tue & Th-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Chavis', with a stylized flourish at the end.

John Chavis

Primary Examiner AU-2191